

A MAGAZINE FOR GOVERNMENT MANAGERS
MANAGEMENT

Volume 3, No. 3

1982

Bridging
the Career/
Non-Career
Gap





Contents

THIS ISSUE

2	Bridging the Gap	Career/noncareer communication
10	Fair Labor Standards	Some reminders about the law
14	Protecting Privacy	Alone in a crowded office
17	Is Publishing Perishing?	Managing publications

EVERY ISSUE

22	Worth Repeating	Are you guilty of put-downs?
24	Legislation	Highlights of 1982
25	Nitty Gritty	Benefits changes
28	Short Takes	News of interest to managers
30	Manager's Reading Digest	Personnel and general management reading
32	First Person, Singular	Executive Development Assignments

Director
Donald J. Devine
Deputy Director
Loretta Cornelius
Director, Office of Public Affairs
Mark Tapscott
Editor
Lee Treese
Design
Hausmann/Krohn, Inc.
Editorial Assistants
Lynn Alfalla,
Annette Gaul, Elstathia A. Siegel, Joyce Cannady
Graphic Assistant
Woody Schuler
Photographer
Tony Jackson

Manuscripts submitted for publication should be typed double spaced (pica, if possible), 1000 to 1500 words, with working title and brief author information. No special permission is required to quote or reprint materials contained in the magazine. However, when articles are identified as having originated outside the Office of Personnel Management, the author should be contacted for reprint permission. Manuscripts will not necessarily be acknowledged or returned.

MANAGEMENT

Vol. 3, No. 3

Management is published quarterly by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Editorial inquiries should be sent to: Lee Treese, Editor, **Management** magazine, Office of Public Affairs, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Washington, D.C. 20415. Telephone (202) 254-8760.

Management is available on subscription from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. \$10.00 domestic \$12.75 foreign. Single copies are \$2.75 domestic, \$3.45 foreign. (Master Card and Visa are accepted.) Use of funds for printing this publication approved by OPM letter of April 28, 1982.

And never the twain shall meet?
Appointees and Career Executives...

BRIDGING THE GAP: A DIALOGUE

The working relationship between career government executives and appointed managers is one that must be reinvented with every change of Administration. With an eye to improving that relationship—and to perhaps shorten the shakedown periods that will be required in the future—the Senior Executives Association this summer sponsored a forum at which the perspectives of both groups were presented and discussed. A summary of participants' viewpoints and suggestions, drastically edited for space, follows.

JERRY SHAW, PRESIDENT

SENIOR EXECUTIVES
ASSOCIATION

I think that all of us would agree that a gap does exist in communication between political appointees and career executives. I would like to suggest a couple reasons for the gap. The first may be because there are misunderstandings. The political executive comes with certain expectations; the careerist has different expectations; they arrive at a point where the expectations are looked at from a different point of view and we have a breakdown.

Frankly, those kinds are easy to fix, and that's part of what this program today is about. But the second kind are more difficult: they may well be because career executives don't like the message. The message may be clear, but we don't like what we are hearing, and that's harder to fix. But it can help us, as careerists, to first know what the message is, and second, to believe that our input and our understanding are needed, wanted and considered. Perhaps the message that some of us don't like is that the Federal government is changing, and maybe it will never be the same. That doesn't mean that it is worse: it might be better, it might be worse, but at least it is going to be different.

If we are all to survive, and the government is to operate well, we must communicate. The speakers today will tell us how they have communicated, and how they have survived in this environment, both as careerists and as political appointees.

DONALD J. DEVINE,
DIRECTOR

U.S. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL
MANAGEMENT

POLITICAL APPOINTEE

It is a pleasure to talk about a very important subject to all of us, because political appointees and career executives have to work together or the government simply can't survive. We have a very, very unique system. Less than twenty percent of the world population lives under a system which has politically appointed individuals based on elections and continuing career service that they can rely on. A handful of countries have survived under this kind of system. It shouldn't surprise us that the topic today is

very difficult to deal with.



I don't understand why a political appointee would be frightened to know all the pros and cons on taking a step.
Devine

We are talking about a subject which is fundamental to our form of government and its survival in the world. As the President mentioned in his speech in London, democracy is a very fragile form of government. And it's critical to the survival of this kind of government that we both do the jobs that the government gives us to do.

That there is some reluctance to look the problem squarely in the face, I can testify from direct experience. My first speech as Director was before the ASPA National Conference in Detroit in April 1961. In it, I made what I thought was a not-exceptional statement, referring to the distinction made by the father of modern public administration, Max Weber, between political leadership and career leadership. In *Politics as a Vocation*, he said that the politician's calling is to take a stand on an issue and the civil service acts on exactly the opposite principle—that of responsibility. "The honor of the civil servant is vested in his ability to execute conscientiously the order of superior authorities. Without this moral discipline and self denial, in the highest sense of the term, the

whole apparatus would fall to pieces." Now some say that means Devine, or Max Weber, whoever they want to blame it on, doesn't want the career civil servants involved in policy making, and that isn't what that means. What it means is that the primary responsibility of the political appointee is to set the direction of policy. And the primary responsibility of the civil servant is to carry it out. It would be foolish to try to separate these into airtight compartments. Even this Administration, which David Broder said came in with a more complete set of policy alternatives than any he has seen in forty years of reporting on the scene, does not come in with a full list of precisely what it wants to do. And even in terms of what the Administration thinks it wants to do, it very much needs the advice of the career civil servant who knows how the system really works and the problems it may have in instituting the program.

So there are two separate fields of primary importance. But they must overlap. I can guarantee you that OPM isn't one of the places where political appointees don't know the career senior executives. I suspect that if you asked them, they would say they see too much of us, if anything. I would consider it the height of folly not to utilize the career expertise that we have.

The political appointee cannot survive if he doesn't know the facts. And the only repository of institutional memory is the career service. As Weber said, that is its very soul.

In OPM, I've instituted a system in which we get a very broad presentation of views in option papers, where we look at all the major alternatives without rejecting any. That is the way to get the career service most involved in the policy process. I hired someone from Capitol Hill recently. He came into one of our first policy meetings and he said it was like going from Sparta to Athens. It was the difference between a Congressional hearing where they get a dictatorial "This is what we are

going to do, you guys go out of the room and try to do it," as compared to a real battling interaction that we had for about four and a half hours with about 40 people in the room.

That is how this interaction should take place. It can only take place, of course, if the political appointee feels that he isn't intimidated by the process: the political side has to take its share of knocks, too. I don't understand why a political appointee would be frightened to know all the pros and cons on taking a step. In my opinion, it's the height of foolishness. The only way that that can be mitigated is to have a high quality of political appointee who isn't threatened by that kind of situation; who has knowledge to deal in that kind of environment. I'm very proud of the quality of people we have. If I could offer one thought on how there can be more career/political interaction, I would suggest trying this broad ranging option process, in which we seriously look at all alternatives without biasing what the final result will be. In my opinion it's the only rational way to arrive at a policy decision. And it's the best way to get good, healthy communications on questions of policy as we politicals try to interpret our mandate from the people.

The key is communication. However, I think we should not overly institutionalize that communication process. Some of the proposals that have been made about governmentwide institutionalization of this communication process are feasible, but I think it has to be done Department by Department. This has to be flexible enough so that the different Departments can handle their various problems. OPM can, and will, provide some guidance.

In one institutionalized and formalized way, I think we can do a lot more. Those of you who have heard me before know that I'm a Johnny-One-Note: The performance appraisal system is the major management tool that we have to help communicate in a formal way. It can't be done solely that way,

and I try to stress the importance of the informal method, but communication can be helped immeasurably through the performance appraisal process. It is the most important management initiative, I think, of the last twenty-five years—certainly of any done through the Civil Service Reform Act. It can increase communication and can also help get the job done better. We've got a tool that can and should work; if there are abuses in it, we've got checks. We have the Merit System Protection Board, we have the Office of Special Counsel and we have the Agency Compliance and Evaluation section in OPM.

We've had political and career executives at the Federal Executive Institute, trying to get together to understand each other's mutual problems. We tried to keep a calm mood during the transition among those on the political side and, as an aside, I would ask a little more patience on the side of career executives during this period. You have to remember that these people are starting from zero and trying to get up to where you've been for twenty years or so. A little more understanding of how difficult it is



Career civil servants have an "advise and consent" role of counsel . . . especially in assessing the impact of political decisions and impact of Administration policy. Keel

to go into a new environment could help.

The basic message I have is that this is a process of mutual accommodation. All of us have our own perspectives and duties, and a place where we come from in this very complex process. The only way that this crazy system can work well is if we have the good will to do it. And that's what I'm sure we are going to be able to do.

ALTON KEEL, ASSOCIATE
DIRECTOR FOR NATIONAL
SECURITY AND INTERNA-
TIONAL AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET

POLITICAL APPOINTEE

I want to start off by sharing with you an evolution of perception that I've gone through in the three fairly unique positions that I've held: one, as a civil servant; one on a professional staff in the U.S. Senate and alternately on the Senate Armed Services Committee; and finally, as a political appointee. As a civil servant, I started off as a program manager and my view was fairly single minded. My task, I felt clearly, was a very important task: it's appropriate for a program manager to feel that way. I felt it was of very significant benefit not only to my agency but to man, if you will. But I must confess, on looking back, that I really didn't have much to judge by, with respect to the priority of the task that I was working on, in relation to other tasks, even my organization—much less government-wide. I think I had a somewhat commonly held view that politicians were very much driven by political considerations and constituent interest; at least they had a very healthy bias in that direction. I eventually became a member of the management staff and I got a

better perspective of the various programs within the entire agency that I was working in. And, I got a better perception of Congress and political appointees.

First off, I recognized that clearly political appointees had power. And political appointees were responsible for setting policy and implementing policy. But I also got from that side of the viewing glass an appreciation that there was difficulty in the interface between appointees and career civil servants. And I saw indications of the impact of that difficulty—the impact being, for the most part, adverse.

My own view of Congress evolved a little more rapidly. I saw that Congress wasn't always driven by simple political priorities or constituent interest. And, particularly in the case of the congressional committees, they often were as interested as I was, as a civil servant, in making sure that the correct program decisions were made. That was a factor in my making a decision to move on to a staff position in Congress and eventually on a committee.

Congress does have a legitimate interest in making the right decisions. That does not mean that there aren't political considerations, as there should be on the part of a member of a political party; and it does not mean that they are not sensitive to constituent interest, as they must be as elected members of that party. But it does mean, in my experience, that it's not for the most part determinate in significant program decisions or policy decisions.

That is not to say that the party, especially of the Administration in power, isn't interested in helping the Administration to implement the policy. They are.

The one facet that I brought with me that perhaps was most beneficial was an appreciation of the value of a civil servant's experience and expertise. Having come from the civil service, I also recognize that they do not always have the opportunity to have a broader view of issues. Part of my

responsibility was to gather that expertise when a situation dictated and put it in proper context and make a decision. The facts were clearly important to gather from civil servants, but it was equally my responsibility then to put them in context.

My view of political appointees also evolved. I saw them even more as the principal architects of a given Administration's policy. And my view of the problem of an interface between the political appointee and the career civil servant was in fact enhanced. At the same time another interface was a problem: that is the one between Congress and political appointees. It may seem ironic to career civil servants, but politicians sometimes have difficulty talking to each other and appreciating the respective roles of the legislative branch and the executive branch. In particular, the political appointee in a number of instances did not appreciate the fact that Congress was legitimately interested in helping a given Administration implement policy. They were dutifully aware of the fact that when an Administration is elected to office, it should be given an opportunity to implement policy. Congress, for the most part, is willing to support that policy. But they also want to have a role in it—just as a career civil servant does with the political appointee. Congress typically is more flexible and more moderate, however, in implementing and final implementation of any new policy.

One thing that has helped me is the sensitivity to Congress, in the role that they play and how they can be of benefit to me in trying to implement and in fact, formulate the Administration policy in an "advise and consent" role, which they clearly and constitutionally have. At the same time, I am sensitive to the interface between political appointee and career civil servant. I recognize that career civil servants have an "advise and consent" role of counsel to me as a political appointee especially in assessing the impact of political decisions and impact of

Administration policy. I also have found that, without exception, the career civil servants that I have worked with only ask for opportunity to have that input, to let you benefit from their expertise and their experience even with respect to new and evolving policy. Given that opportunity, without exception civil servants are willing to assist you in implementing the policy that is formulated. The key is mutual accommodation between political appointee and civil servant. I have every ground to say that that accommodation can be successful.

JAMES COLVARD, DEPUTY CHIEF

U.S. NAVAL MATERIAL COMMAND

CAREER EXECUTIVE

As the previous two speakers have said, I think the key to communication is understanding the point of view of the other person. So I have listed very briefly some characteristics of each of those groups to present to you. I think that if you consider these, whether you are a politician, a political appointee or a career civil servant, it gives you a better understanding of where the other person is coming from, so you are more capable of at least understanding their point of view.

First, look at *tenure*. The tenure for a political appointee is quite short; the average in the last twenty years has been two years. The period for a career civil servant is about thirty years. It is not unexpected, then, that the political appointee would have a hasty agenda because he or she has little time to achieve it. Then look at the *criteria for selection*, the rules by which people are appointed. In the career civil service, albeit sometimes flawed, there is a

merit-based system and advancement to the top is usually based on demonstrated skills in the area in which you are trying to work. The criteria for selection for political appointees vary: they may involve skill, they may involve national recognition. But they have one thing in common and that is the allegiance to the political party that appoints them. In terms of *value sets*, there is a value set within the political appointee for change. There is within the career civil servant who is a part of this system for thirty years a value set for stability. Automatically, you have differing values in terms of what you are going to accomplish. The natural *loyalty* of a political appointee is to the Administration that appointed him. In some respects, the political appointee has much less freedom, in terms of taking action than he or she might believe in, than a career civil servant. Because one does not publicly espouse policy contrary to the Administration very long. Whether you are Democrat or Republican doesn't matter. The loyalty of the career civil servant is to the system or the profession of which he or she is a part.

The next item I had on my list of characteristics was originally motivation, but I marked it out, because I think that's quite ambiguous: motivation can be for a variety of things, so I substituted instead the *sense of urgency* which is tied to the feeling of change. Urgency, the need to get things done, on the part of the political appointee, is quite high. On the part of career civil servants it is moderate to low. At most they are moderately motivated to make change. As a previous speaker has said, the *knowledge of the system* of the political appointee is quite low. The knowledge of the system of the career civil servant is by necessity quite high—or it should be.

The final item that I've listed is *risk taking*. By nature, the political appointee is a high risk taker. By the nature of a stable system, the career civil servant is a low risk taker.

(This list of characteristics does not solve the problem of the interface, and it is not exhaustive, and I'm sure it is not strange to you.) My point, as a career civil servant who has worked with many political appointees, is that the burden of making the system work, coming from our value set, lies in our hands as professional public employees. It does no good to watch the guy who has been appointed to drive your car drive it over the cliff while you are a passenger. And if we don't take the professional time necessary to understand, not only our own values and point of view, but also the reality and the integrity of the value set and point of view of the political appointee, then we shall forever be blaming each other, as we ride over the cliff together.

CHARLES BINGMAN

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE
DEPUTY SECRETARY

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

CAREER EXECUTIVE

I'd like to turn to the theme of the political transition, because I think it is perhaps not only the period of greatest risk in communications and relationships but it is probably also the most revealing time in which to explore these relationships; and it's a time where doing something right, or making some bad mistakes, you're probably going to affect the entire balance of that relationship. I have served through some very interesting political transitions. In OMB, where I saw them trying to do a very responsible handoff from one Administration to the next, I was in a Department at a time when I was on a political appointment, and an Administration of the opposite party came in. The discomfort index was pretty high! Later, I got actively involved in



It does no good to watch the guy who has been appointed to drive your car drive it over the cliff while you are a passenger.
Colvard

this Reagan transition, both on the transition team and in a later special assignment, in the White House Office of Policy Development. The kind of concerns that I'm going to present are those of careerists who are watching these transitions, trying to answer several questions.

1. I think it's very important to try to answer: What do these new people really think? What are they after? So that I can try to decide how to respond to that concern.

2. The question is eternal: What is going to happen to me personally? How am I going to come out of this? How do I establish my own relationships personally, as well as professionally, with the new leadership?

3. Am I going to be a player in the game? Am I to be consulted? Will I have a role, or am I to be ignored or shunted to the side?

These questions are burdened with a lot of malaise of various kinds. There is the natural problem of trying to establish a relationship between two groups of strangers. There is a degree of political suspicion of the career establishment and vice versa. There is the high expectation that there will be a lot of policy change and institutional change

and there are a lot of fears growing from that alone.

I think the transition time illuminates a lot of these issues. It is a period where you can set the tone for a whole relationship or the balance of an Administration's term in office. I think that the career executive should approach each one of these transitions with a strategy of his own. Don Devine has suggested we should recognize that agenda of a new Administration are not going to be singular and balanced and of equal importance. I was going to suggest three levels in which to try to scrutinize the agenda of the new Administration coming in. This is somewhat arbitrary but for the purpose of this discussion, let me talk about a priority agenda, a second uncertainty agenda, and, thirdly, a kind of unformed agenda.

The *priority agenda* is what the Administration knows with great certainty that it wants to do in certain areas and has established priorities that will mark its early days in office. The Reagan Administration did, in fact, come in with the best formed agenda of that kind in recent memory: very strong, a sense of priorities across the whole range of government activities. A very tight knit, rather intimate group of people who were used to working together largely in the context of the campaign. Contacts of known intimate sources, people that they could trust, most of whom were outside of the executive branch of government. And the best advice I could give you in context of this priority agenda is "Don't get in the way." As a couple of our speakers have suggested, the Administration is wont to get out of the blocks very quickly. They not only want to produce action but to produce it very quickly.

Don't feel bad if you don't get consulted, because they have derived a lot of the evolution of their positions from these outside sources that have been more important to them than you have been. The most positive role that I have seen is to do two or three things. You ought to give them feed-back in terms of whether the policy position is understood. Some of these political

leadership people are amazingly bad communicators. They think they have said to you what their policies are when often they have not. I don't think we want to be in the position of having mere misunderstandings appear to be resistance.

A lot can be done to be factual and supportive by supplying information that illuminates the positions that the new leadership wants to take. This is the time to point out pitfalls, even though there may be risks in doing so, because I think in the long run there are greater risks in not doing so.

What I call the *uncertainty agenda* harks back to what Don Devine was saying. The new crowd does not necessarily know what it wants to do on every one of its intentions. There are a lot of areas in which they want to do something, or they know that they've got a problem, but they are generally uncertain as to how to move. They tend to react by relying to some degree again on that external source of association; but it is not that effective in this arena. They also tend to rely on certain basic principles which they have established as part of their campaign, and use the test of those principles to try to determine how the policy outcome should

take place. But there is a growing recognition that there are no easy answers to some of those problems. The career reaction then ought to be to view this agenda as an excellent chance to take a greater initiative. This is where the real strength of the career leadership comes most forcefully into play. We've got some enormously valuable resources to bring to this kind of policy formulation process. We are most capable of producing the full panorama or advantages and disadvantages to alternative policy options. We have a knowledge of client base and Hill views that is probably superior to what the political leadership has. We can begin to come on very constructively and establish linkages that will show that we are capable of contributing to these policy debates.

The third agenda is what I called the *unformed agenda* because there is almost always a set of problems which the new political leadership didn't know it had or didn't initially understand. Often the hallmark of some of the best Administrations is whether they are capable of moving beyond the first relatively few high priorities that they set for themselves, and accomplish more things in their Administration than they knew they could. This also is probably a time of greatest advantage for the career bureaucracy. At the very least, we ought to be providing distinct early warning on problems that are sneaking up on the political leadership. We can also talk about some of the things that are important to us: repair and maintenance of the institution that we work in and that we represent; reform and improvement of some of its systems of management that frequently get out of repair faster than we know how to fix them. Many of these items will take place, not during the initial big rush of an Administration, but perhaps in the second and third years, where if they are truly successful they will begin to look for other ways to leave a strong record for their Administration.

I suggest that each one of these different kinds of agenda can be perceived at the outset of an Ad-



I don't think we want to be in a position of having mere misunderstandings appear to be resistance. Bingman

ministration and that we as career executives can develop somewhat different response patterns, different ways of supporting and communicating and, in fact, different ways of creating our own initiative in what, as other speakers have said, is genuinely a joint venture for the benefit of the American public.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Q: How would you assess the morale, motivation, the enthusiasm, the mental health, of the career executive in government? And, assuming it's not as good as it should be, what needs to be done about it?

A: Bingman: I think that the attitude of career executives now is pretty bad. I think it stems in large part from a sense of the deterioration of the quality of the executive role in the federal establishment. I'm trying to say this in a way that transcends some of the short term issues of RIF's in the Departments or Agencies or disrupting reorganizations. Watching the course of events of the federal government, it seems somehow to be getting worse instead of better without a clear understanding of how the tide can be reversed.

Also we find a lot of increased speculation now among people who five years ago tended to assume that they were going to stay in government for a long haul, are now increasingly looking at what options that they've got outside of the government. You could say that is either good or bad, depending on how you feel about the dynamics of the development of your own career. But I think most of us tend to want to stay and find out and we draw on a sense of high-order professionalism. Where we think that professionalism is threatened, I think that it substantially reduces our comfort in being a federal executive.

A: Colvard: I'm not sure I can comment on the attitude within the whole federal service, but I don't sense that it's quite as bad as people say. I think that there's a high disillusionment with the political process in the sense of the cut-back of the number of people that would be eligible for bonuses. I don't think that there is any question that that was viewed by the career service as a kind of betrayal, a reneging on an agreement when we signed up for the Senior Executive Service. I think that the pay raise last year

recaptured a little bit of that, but it wasn't just the money, it was bellying up to the bar and recognizing that you have to pay attention to executives if you are going to retain them.

I would suspect for the next three years that the attrition rate is going to be flat, because the inflation has dropped off and it's economically to your advantage to stay in now for your high-three. I would project if the situation continues at the end of that three you are going to see a large lemming jump over the cliff, for those over fifty-five. We have a year and a half to work on it. I guess my message would be if we don't like what is going on, as professionals we have an opportunity to deal with it. I don't sense that it's that bad.

I think that the evaluation process interaction is viewed as very positive. If those things that we commit to are viewed as having some credibility in the long haul, I think it will stabilize, and we can build a sense of professionalism. If there is another betrayal, or if political expediency is the call of the day, then I think that credibility will be lost for many years to come. I would hate to see that because I think that the great strength of the country is having a stable professional force more or less like the military. Their professionalism and their stability have made the Department of Defense have very little problem with transitions in administration. If we can complement that in the total federal government or emulate that to a degree with highly professional and very stable career civil servants, then I see great hope. But if we sit around and wring our hands, we will all go to hell in the same hand basket.

A: Devine: I guess I agree with Jim. I don't see that great dissatisfaction at the Executive level. There have been some problems. You may have read that we were going to go forward on the bonus thing, that we were going to lift the OPM limitation of 20 percent and go back to the statutory 25 percent before Congress brought the statuto-

ry limitation down to the 20 percent level. I think, in looking through the study of the senior executives, that the real problem is pay. We've worked on it and I was very happy to see that we did get some success with Congress on that last fall. I still want to get that raised. After all, I'm affected by the pay cap, too!

If there is a difference between career and political executives, it revolves around the difference between risk taking and change, I think. This Administration, even more than most, is one that wants to make large changes in a relatively short period of time. A political leadership that wants even more change than usual is obviously going to have a wider problem in terms of getting support from a service that emphasizes the stability value. I see this as a kind of natural process that takes place which is probably taking longer because our agenda is for more dramatic change.

In terms of the basics, I think that the real problem among senior executives is that they correctly perceive that they are not being paid adequately for what they are doing. That we are still going to work on.

Q: We all hoped that when we signed into the SES, we had mobility; we were all going to be perceived as general managers who were interchangeable and could go from Energy, to Education, to DOD We don't find this happening. We feel that OPM doesn't play an aggressive role. Departments are going to refuse to bring us in because they would like to do their own hiring. We don't see a strong willingness to retrain SES'ers. We have to have specific qualifications for specific jobs. There is a strong fear that, all of a sudden, we are going to find that after the government spent millions of dollars bringing us up to these positions, after twenty to thirty years in government, not eligible for retirement, we're out in the street. And the only salvation is strong aggressive action on the part of OPM through development of training, to



force the agencies and departments to objectively and openly provide for migration from one office to another.

A: Devine: This is a very, very difficult problem and I don't really understand why we can't place a greater percentage of the senior executives than we do. I don't find, at least voiced, any reluctance on the part of the receiving Departments. You are correct that, all other things being equal, agencies prefer to hire people who have been trained within their own organization. Part of the problem is looking at the kind of positions that are on our outplacement list: A good number of individuals, although they are managers, must have a kind of a technical expertise.

I don't have any easy answers. We put the pressure on the agencies, but when it gets down to it, it's a judgment call on their part as to whether the person can do the job or not. I'm certainly willing to listen to possible solutions to the problem.

Q: I think one area we are most concerned about may be some kind of cross-training. We would like to see you and make some of these suggestions, like sending SES'ers to the universities or Federal Executive Institute or whatever?

A: Devine: Don't you always have to do that on a job by job basis? You have to identify the job to know what to train them for, and that's the problem. You can't esti-

mate which one is going to open. The problems that we found with the general training programs, CETA and so forth, is that you've trained people for jobs that were there when you set the program up but when the program is over the jobs aren't there any more. It's a very complex and difficult job and I'm certainly open to suggestions. All that I can say is write us and let us know what they are. ■

The Fair Labor Standards Act

and YOU

By Lynn I. Alfalla

The burgeoning of the twentieth century brought many changes to the American labor force — including poverty, unemployment and depression. President Franklin D. Roosevelt told Congress in 1937, "One third of our population, the overwhelming majority of which is in agriculture or industry, is ill-nourished, ill-clad and ill-honored." In 1938, Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) which extended minimum wage coverage to men, women and children "engaged in commerce." It was an attempt to combat against deplorable working conditions such as sweat shops and to bolster a failing economy while ensuring a "living wage" for the working man.

Forty-two years and several amendments later, it is still im-

portant protective legislation. Its 1974 amendments (Public Law 93-259) brought all federal employees under the FLSA umbrella. Although the Department of Labor has administered the FLSA in the private sector since its inception, the responsibility for administering the Act with respect to federal employees fell upon the Civil Service Commission, now the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

The key provisions under the FLSA include:

- a minimum wage rate for all hours of work;

- an overtime rate of pay for excessive hours of work;
- prohibitions against oppressive child labor practices, and
- equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

At the time the 1974 amendments were enacted, federal employees were already paid at or above the minimum wage rate. Likewise, as a matter of general policy, the federal government had complied with the child labor and equal pay provisions of the Act for some time. In addition, most federal employees were already entitled to overtime pay for hours of work in excess of 8 in a day or 40 in a week under title 5, United States Code.

Federal managers and supervisors should acquaint themselves with the FLSA and OPM regula-



tions and instructions for administration of the Act because it can affect what one can ask employees to do, when they can do it and for what kind of compensation. Know who is exempt and who is non-exempt and therefore subject to the provisions of the Act. Elementary as that might appear, it is essential for your protection as well as for that of your employees. Keep in mind that the primary purpose of the FLSA *still* is to protect employees in nonsupervisory positions from unfair wage and hour practices by management.

Exemptions

Although the Act covers all federal employees, certain employees are exempt from its minimum wage and overtime provisions. In the federal sector, there are two general categories of exemptions: (1) employees in executive, administrative and professional positions; and (2) employees permanently stationed in a foreign country or a territory not within the jurisdiction of the United States.

An agency is responsible for determining the status of its employees under the Act. Criteria to determine whether a federal employee meets the executive exemption depend primarily on the "grade controlling" duty concept. Employees whose jobs are supervisory and those who are general foremen or higher in the Federal Wage System are exempt executives.

Administrative and professional positions are judged with respect to the responsibility level, the amount of education, training and knowledge needed for that type of position and the independent judgment processes involved.

The foreign exemption applies to federal employees who are permanently stationed in a foreign country or a territory not under the jurisdiction of the United States (geographical exemption). It also applies to employees who are temporarily stationed in a foreign country for an entire workweek.

Title 5/FLSA Overtime Pay Comparison—Example 1

GS 4, Step 1—Hourly Basic Rate of Pay \$5.52
Overtime Rate of Pay \$8.28

- Employee's basic 40-hour workweek: Monday through Friday 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (½ hour meal period)
- Overtime work: Employee performed 8 hours of overtime work on Saturday—8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Hours Worked	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Sat	Total Hours
Regular hours		8	8	8	8	8		40
Overtime hours							8	8

TITLE 5

- (1) Overtime hours—8 hours
- (2) Overtime pay

$$\$8.28 \times 8 \text{ hours} = \$66.24$$

FLSA

- (1) Hours worked—48
- (2) Computation of hourly "regular rate" of pay

$$\$5.52 \times 48 \text{ hours} = \$264.96$$

$$\$264.96 \div 48 = \$5.52$$

- (3) Overtime pay

$$1 \times \$5.52 \times 8 \text{ hours} = \$44.16$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \times \$5.52 \times 8 \text{ hours} = \$22.08$$

$$\$66.24$$

Summary: • Employee's entitlement to overtime pay is the same under Title 5 and the FLSA.

- Employee is paid:

Basic pay	\$220.80
Overtime pay	66.24
	<hr/> \$287.04

Hours Worked

Under the FLSA, the number of hours worked is the key figure in determining an employee's entitlement to overtime pay. Basically, the hours of work include all *actual* time spent performing work for "the benefit of an agency and under the control of an agency." It includes work that is "suffered or permitted." (Work "suffered or permitted" emphasizes that the employee's supervisor: 1) must have knowledge of the work performed and 2) must have an opportunity to prevent the work being done.) It does not include paid hours of nonwork—leave (annual and sick), holidays, or excused ab-

sences. Under the FLSA, work in excess of 40 hours a week is overtime work. Entitlement to overtime pay does not accrue until the employee has actually worked more than 40 hours in a week.

The FLSA "workday" begins when an employee commences the "principal activity(s)" of his employment and ends with the cessation of that activity(s). Rest periods up to 20 minutes are considered as part of the workday. However, "bona fide" meal periods are excluded from hours of work. Supervisors should ensure that an employee's "workday" under the FLSA is the same as his or her regularly scheduled tour of

duty under title 5. This can be achieved by ensuring that the employee does not perform work outside his or her regularly scheduled tour of duty unless you intend the work to be done and the employee is to be paid.

Time spent in other activities such as travel or training outside an employee's regular workday is subject to certain conditions. In these circumstances, supervisors should refer to OPM regulations and instructions (See Footnote 1) to determine when such activities are considered work and how to compensate an employee for the time spent in such activities.

Overtime Compensation

Although the FLSA amendments of 1974 did not modify any existing laws pertaining to federal employees, they do entitle non-exempt employees to coverage under two laws for overtime pay. A non-exempt employee's overtime work will be computed under the FLSA and title 5, with the employee entitled to whichever affords the greater overtime pay benefit.

Under title 5, an employee is entitled to overtime pay computed at 1½ times his or her "basic rate" of pay (See Footnote 2): an employee who earns \$8.00 an hour earns \$12.00 an hour for hours in excess of 8 in a day or 40 in a week. Under the FLSA, an employee's overtime pay is computed on the basis of the employee's hourly "regular rate" of pay. An employee's hourly "regular rate" of pay is not necessarily the same as the employee's "basic rate" of pay because certain payments—such as night and Sunday differentials, and environmental differential—are included in the regular rate. Night differential is payable for work scheduled between 6 p.m.–6 a.m. at 10 percent of the hourly basic rate of pay. Both Sunday and environmental differentials are payable at 25 percent. These and other similar payments are outlined in OPM regulations and instructions. (See Footnote 1)

Rather simplistically illustrated, the employee's overtime

Title 5/FLSA Overtime Pay Comparison—Example 2

GS 4, Step 1—Hourly Basic Rate of Pay \$5.52
Overtime Rate of Pay \$8.28

- Employee's basic 40-hour workweek: Monday through Friday 1:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. (½ hour meal period)
- Overtime work: Employee performed 8 hours of overtime work on Saturday—8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Hours Worked	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Sat	Total Hours
Regular hours		8	8	8	8	8		40
Overtime hours							8	8
Night Pay		3	3	3	3	3		15

TITLE 5

- (1) Overtime hours—8 hours
- (2) Overtime pay

$$\$8.28 \times 8 \text{ hours} = \$66.24$$

FLSA

- (1) Hours worked—48
- (2) Computation of hourly "regular rate" of pay

$$\$5.52 \times 48 \text{ hours} = \$264.96$$

$$\$.55 \times 15 \text{ hours} = 8.25$$

$$\text{Total remuneration} = \$273.21$$

$$\$273.21 \div 48 = \$ 5.69$$

- (3) Overtime pay

$$1 \times \$5.52 \times 8 \text{ hours} = \$44.16$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \times \$5.69 \times 8 \text{ hours} = 22.80$$

$$\underline{\$66.96}$$

Summary: • Employee's entitlement to overtime pay is greater under the FLSA.

- Employee is paid:

Basic pay \$220.80

Night pay 8.25

FLSA Overtime pay 66.96

\$296.01

Title 5/FLSA Overtime Pay Comparison—Example 3

GS 12, Step 1—Hourly Basic Rate of Pay \$13.58

Overtime Rate of Pay (GS 10/1) \$15.47

- Employee's basic 40-hour workweek: Monday through Friday 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (½ hour meal period)
- Overtime work: Employee performed 8 hours of overtime work on Saturday—8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Hours Worked	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Sat	Total Hours
Regular hours		8	8	8	8	8		40
Overtime hours							8	8

TITLE 5

(1) Overtime hours—8 hours

(2) Overtime pay

$$\$15.47 \times 8 \text{ hours} = \$123.76$$

FLSA

(1) Hours worked—48

(2) Computation of hourly "regular rate" of pay

$$\$13.58 \times 48 \text{ hours} = \$651.84$$

$$\$651.84 \div 48 = \$13.58$$

(3) Overtime pay

$$1 \times \$13.58 \times 8 \text{ hours} = \$108.64$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \times \$13.58 \times 8 \text{ hours} = 54.32$$

$$\underline{\$162.96}$$

Summary: • Employee's entitlement to overtime pay is greater under FLSA.

- Employee is paid:

Basic pay \$543.20

FLSA Overtime pay 162.96

$$\underline{\$706.16}$$

under the FLSA is computed as follows: His hourly regular rate of pay is computed by dividing total allowable items of compensation for the week by the total number of hours of work. The hourly regular rate is then used to compute his FLSA overtime entitlement. For example, if he works 48 hours, with differentials such as Sunday, night or hazard pay, his straight-pay plus differentials for the 48 hours would be totaled and then divided by 48 to obtain his hourly regular rate of pay. He is then paid his straight time rate of pay and one-half times his regular rate of pay for the 8 hours of overtime work under the FLSA. (See Examples)

As mentioned above, non-exempt employees are covered by both FLSA and title 5 and are entitled to whichever affords them the greater overtime pay.

Compensatory Time

The FLSA provides only for the payment of overtime pay for excess hours. In contrast, title 5 provides overtime pay or, under certain conditions, compensatory time off as compensation for overtime work. OPM guidance under FLSA provides for continued use of compensatory time off, at an employee's request, under limited rules.

The philosophy underlying the Fair Labor Standards Act, the concern with fairness and with adequate compensation for work performed, exists today as it did when the FLSA was passed. OPM's task of administration of the FLSA in the federal government is an important one. Federal managers and supervisors can play their part by understanding and complying with the provisions of the Act. ■

Lynn I. Alfalfa is a writer-editor in the Office of Public Affairs, OPM.

1) OPM regulations can be found in 5 CFR, Part 551 and OPM instructions in the FPM Letters (551 Series).

2) For an employee whose pay exceeds the pay for GS-10, Step 1, the overtime rate is 1½ times the rate of pay for GS-10, Step 1.

PROTECTING PRIVACY: MINDING YOUR OWN BUSINESS

By Annette Gaul



Unless people suffer phobias on the scale of Howard Hughes, they probably enjoy a degree of privacy for several very practical reasons: uninterrupted thinking, serious concentration or some good old-fashioned peace and quiet. And, unless a person has a job with "perks" like a private suite, dining room and toilet, the average worker is a victim of acoustical, visual and thermal assault.

Privacy is a basic human need. As sights, sounds, smells and people vie for attention, a point may be reached at which "Enough, Already!" should be shouted. Especially at work, where machines click, beep and hum; telephones ring constantly; people talk; air conditioners rumble; the coffee machine gurgles; and doors creak. All the activity in the office and out of the window; the barrage of colors, shapes and sizes; a person's strong perfume; another's lack of deodorant; someone else's spilled lunch; . . . these and numerous other distractions compete for reaction.

Privacy at Work

Most workers do not want to be distracted by noise or be constantly in full view of others—especially while performing demanding work.

"Privacy has a very useful function," declare Paul Insell and Henry Clay Lindgren in *Too Close for Comfort: The Psychology of Crowding*. "It plays a number of roles. It allows us to be offstage, take off our masks, have a breather, and be ourselves." They note also that privacy is essential to "observe and deal with ourselves without distractions of others' in-



put. It is privacy that permits us to carry out self-evaluation, a fundamental process in attaining self-understanding and self-identity."

Employees spend up to one-fourth of their week at their jobs. Being "on" for over forty hours a week without reprieve can be draining, affecting an employee's productivity.

In a 1980 study by researchers at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, results indicated that people valued privacy over accessibility, preferred enclosed work spaces because they allowed more time actually spent working rather than at appearing to be working, and disliked working in full view of supervisors. It would be safe to estimate that no one likes to have his boss constantly hovering over his shoulder or breathing down his neck. By the same token, supervisors should not be put in a position where they appear to be hovering or eavesdropping.

Privacy is a management problem as well as a design problem. Supervisors need privacy to counsel employees, work out disciplinary problems, discuss performance appraisals, give individual assignments and perform other types of management functions.

Privacy in the office is often perceived as a privilege of rank and is closely related to space allotment. In the government, enlightened luminaries who understood the relationship between space, rank and privacy established Federal Property Management Regulations 101-17.304-1 determining how much space an employee should get. A GS-13 nonsupervisory position, for example, has a space allowance of 100 sq. ft. Add an additional 50 sq. ft. for a supervisor of that rank. Supergrades average anywhere between 250 to 400 sq. ft. and executive schedule personnel have an allowance of up to 750 sq. ft.

The Regulations also state that "Private offices should be provided only when there is demonstrated functional need. They should only be large enough for the occupant to conduct his normal

business with a reasonable degree of dignity." No examples of "demonstrated functional need" or definitions for "reasonable degree of dignity" are provided.

Privacy as status is an age old concept. A person's apparent level of importance in the organization correlates to the degree of privacy he has. Says Michael Korda, author of *Success*, "The more difficult access to the executive is made, the more he can carry success with him, like a snail's shell. Nothing is more distressing to someone pampered by success than being exposed to people ignorant of his status." Privacy and inaccessibility are not, however, synonymous. Korda suggests people who perceive it as such may be cloaking their insecurity.

But does privacy matter to the rest of us? A 1980 Harris poll of employees and executives on factors affecting privacy and comfort at work revealed that 67% of those responding considered "a place to work when you need to concentrate without distractions" to be very important. In the same poll, less than 1 in 3 respondents thought top executives were concerned about employee privacy. Ironically, 75% of polled executives responded they were indeed concerned.

Approximately half of the nation's white collar work force, including managers, work in an open office—a design in which partitions and furniture rather than permanent walls are used in establishing work stations. The idea was first introduced in the 1950's as a method to provide improved cost and workflow efficiency as well as increased flexibility and control. Lack of privacy is a major problem in open offices if they are designed incorrectly—conversations are rarely private and many people are in constant view of each other. As one government manager who works in an open office put it, "This would be a great setup if we were working on a quilt. But we're not. It's a very distracting environment."

In a 1978 Harris poll, workers were asked what they would most like to change about their open

office work spaces. The two most common responses were "More privacy, to be separated from others or to have my own office" and "More personal space, a larger space." Joel Makower, author of *Office Hazards: How Your Job Can Make You Sick*, suggests that discomforts such as a lack of privacy, proper lighting and temperature control can reduce productivity and contribute to workers' physical and psychological stress. He quotes T. George Harris' description of an open office as being "a sort of mental nudist camp, where nobody, not even executives, has any privacy."

Besides the lack of privacy, people who work in open offices point out the irony of "flexibility." "Flexibility for whom?" questions one government employee, "Certainly not for us. They move one divider or desk and the whole design is altered. Flexibility is the manager's: it's just cheaper to move us around into an upheaval than it used to be."

The intent of open office designers was admirable. Designing mazes of cubicles was a valiant effort to upgrade the "cabbage patches and bull pens" in which hordes of employees were seated in one large room. To provide workers additional privacy, ceiling or chest-high partitions were introduced—this way workers could expect the Minotaur to appear around the partition rather than linger in the main doorway. What remained ignored, however, was a well-known and basic belief of behavioral scientists and environmental psychologists that people need and desire privacy and control over their personal territory. Comments another government worker, "People in my office feel that sitting almost on each others' laps is not what was intended with the concept of teamwork."

Involving workers in the design of their offices may be considered a revolutionary idea. Such participatory design was, in fact, conducted experimentally by the General Services Administration (GSA) in 1972 for two federal facilities. At one facility, employees



contributed to the design process down to choosing their own furniture. At the other, it was business as usual, with the interior designers making all the decisions. In a subsequent survey, the first group was more satisfied with their work environment. The second facility, however, won the architectural design awards. Unfortunately, the experiment was never repeated nor the relative productivity of the arrangement measured.

People who spend eight or more hours a day in one setting want their own space to personalize—a place with proper lighting, a comfortable temperature, a low noise level. Environmental psychologist Dr. Robert Sommer, believing many work spaces to be dull and impersonal, comments, “I don’t feel it necessary to ‘prove’ that people in colorful offices will type more accurately, stay healthier or buy more government bonds than people in drab offices. People should have the right to attractive and humane working conditions . . . This is a curious double standard. If an employee hangs up a poster by his desk, he is imposing his values and artistic tastes on the other employees, but if management paints all the walls in the building grey or institutional green, that is part of the natural order. We eventually tune them out and become alienated from the very building in which we spend our daylight hours.”

Tips for Getting and Protecting Privacy

- In private offices, use the door when working on deadline. People will not feel as free to disrupt. When under less pressure, leave it open. “A lock on the door means the power to think for one’s self”—to quote Virginia Woolf.
- Tell a secretary or group receptionist to hold phone calls. Ask that messages be taken to minimize interference from the outside. Managers should be responsive to such employee requests and make the proper protocol arrangements.
- Use the agency’s library for blocks of uninterrupted time. Find out about the policy for using conference rooms. Although they are usually deep within executive territory, they may be available when no other events are scheduled.
- Ask permission to use the office of someone who may be out for a period of time on detail, or due to annual leave or illness.
- Stake out personal territory by positioning your furniture, body and other objects such as machines for greater privacy. To quote Robert Frost, “Good fences make good neighbors.”
- Place a name sign somewhere on the border of your work area to mark it clearly as yours. Personalize the area with objects like plants, prints, or photographs to warm up a sterile work environment.
- Use a small reading lamp to concentrate. People will begin to understand the signal as a request not to be disturbed.
- Express yourself. A simple “I don’t want to be disturbed right now” or “I’m on deadline, talk to you later” will probably suffice.
- Inquire about the possibility of soundproofing rooms if noise becomes unbearable.
- Keep papers or books in vacant chairs to inhibit disruption by drop-ins.
- Use a public phone for private calls to avoid being overheard (although speech privacy is not usually mandatory because voices blend in with the background noise).
- Come to work early or stay late to give yourself uninterrupted time.
- Train yourself not to look up every time someone passes your desk.
- Put a sign on your desk—“Thinking Is Working” or “Please Don’t Disturb, Genius At Work.”—and display it only when you really need privacy most.
- Respect others’ needs for privacy when they are working. Use the old “do-unto” rule.

If these suggestions don’t work, try the count-your-blessings approach. In a New York based health insurer’s offices, employees are not allowed wall posters or photographs, plants are not permitted over a stipulated height, and coats may only be hung in specific areas. Other corporations require “regulation” everything down to the brand of staplers employees use and desks must be in specific order when employees leave at the end of the day.

Let’s face it: Cruising the halls or going to the rest room just to get away from it all is not the solution. Make every effort to be as comfortable as possible, providing the amount of privacy necessary. Approach your work environment positively; introduce change into it; influence it with your personal choices. Allow privacy and freedom for refreshing the self for tasks by reflecting and doing self-evaluations. Determine privacy needs and be forthright in meeting them; stop waiting for someone else to do it.

If all else fails, work harder to get a promotion—one that comes with a nice private office.■

DO NOT DISTURB

Annette Gaul is a writer-editor who occupies 67.5 square feet in the Office of Public Affairs, OPM.



IS PUBLISHING PERISHING?

By Efstathia A. Siegel

At a Cabinet meeting on management initiatives this summer, Agriculture Secretary John Block was slightly startled when President Reagan commended him on a job well done. The cause for praise was the elimination of the pamphlet, "Creative Bathrooms", a "how-to" formerly put out by the Department. "Creative Bathrooms" was precisely the type of publication the President believes American tax dollars should not be paying for.

The elimination of this and thousands of other government publications results from an April 20th, 1981, Presidential Order that directed federal Departments and agencies to put an end to all wasteful and superfluous publications and audiovisual products.

Targeted for extinction were all government magazines, pamphlets and audiovisual products whose primary function was to promote an agency or agency program. The Order made it clear that taxpayers' dollars should not be spent on Madison Avenue type hype.

Taking action that was covered widely by Washington media, the President imposed an immediate moratorium on the printing, production and procurement of all new publications and audiovisuals. At the same time, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) instructed agencies to review and justify all existing products.

Robin Raborn, Deputy Press Of-

ficer at OMB, explains that the purpose of the moratorium was to offer agency management the chance to compile and review all continuing publications and to reconsider under the guidelines the necessity of new productions. "In no way is the Administration trying to control content. Editorial decisions should be left to individual agencies, not to OMB," she emphasizes.

During the review, top management in each agency checked publications and films for content. Those not considered essential to accomplishing an agency's mission were to be eliminated. Generally, all publications and audiovisual products had to be justified in terms of need, cost, audience, purpose, etc. Agencies were to consider switching from color printing to black ink only or using cheaper quality paper.

In subsequent guidelines from OMB, agencies were instructed to

submit lists of all periodicals and recurring pamphlets (essentially anything printed more than once), their costs and other data pertinent to their production, as well as plans for control systems based on OMB models. A second review was undertaken, using OMB approved control systems, to justify continuing publications and to cut costs further.

By June 1982, all agencies were using OMB approved plans to manage their publications and audiovisual programs. Proposals for new publications were "strongly discouraged." The repeated message from the Administration was loud and clear: Cut back and save.

Government's Obligation for Free Information?

In imposing the moratorium and cutbacks, the President emphasized the need to stop government's self promotion activities. A basic question remains, however: Does the government have a responsibility to provide any information to the public free of charge?

Some argue that taxpayer dollars pay for government research and studies and that results of that research should be made available to the public without charge.

The U.S. Congress Joint Committee on Printing, which oversees the Government Printing Office (GPO), takes the position that free access to information is a prime responsibility of government. The Administration's position, according to Raborn, is that "information clearly dealing with matters of public safety or health should be provided to the public. Decisions beyond that have to be made by individual agencies."

How individual agencies make those decisions is not clear. No one existing statute mandates government's public information responsibilities, although legislation exists that curtails agencies' self promotion and lobbying efforts. It cannot be disputed, however, that administration policy profoundly affects agency decisions. And, the Administration has made it clear that the bottom line is savings.

Cutting Back on the "Golden Age"

The Department of Agriculture has made dramatic changes in its publications policies. Nelson Fitton, spokesman for Agriculture's Governmental and Public Affairs Office and head of its Publications Division for over 16 years, sums up the situation: "The golden age of government publications is over." Nearly 750 titles have been eliminated by Agriculture since the moratorium, with cost savings of well over \$10 million anticipated through 1983.

As one of government's biggest publishers, Agriculture helped set the trend for all government publications management by cutting back. "Traditionally, Agriculture's policy has been to provide information to the public at minimal cost to the agency," says Fitton. The thinking was that by mailing out cheaply produced pamphlets on specific subjects, the agency could best respond to its public information needs. A leaflet is cheaper than individual letters.

Fitton explains, "In 1981, Governmental and Public Affairs received over 350,000 inquiries from the public. (Some years there have been as many as three quarters of a million inquiries). We mainly used our inexpensive publications, which cost the agency from less than \$.01 to \$.13 per copy, to respond to many of these inquiries. Since the moratorium, this policy has changed to greatly restrict distribution."

Rob Atkiss, spokesman for the Federal Publishers Committee, a group that studies publishing issues and proposes remedies, asserts that too much emphasis on the cost cutting aspects of the moratorium has resulted in the elimination of many useful and popular publications. "In making large scale and rapid cuts, little attention was given to the publication's message or to the reason for its existence," Atkiss maintains.

It appears that government's formerly well-fed spring of free information is drying up. At Agriculture, free distribution of all publications (except those justified or exempted by law or regulation) is limited to 1,000 copies. These copies are mainly distributed within the

Department, to libraries and to the media. Any requests in excess of the 1,000 copy limit will have to be paid for, either through user fees or through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). By Spring 1983, even the Consumer Information Center in Pueblo, Colorado, will start charging \$1.00 for any order of two or more publications (up to 20).

Just as its free distribution policies are changing, so, it seems, are government's information gathering policies. The Administration believes that private industry and the public will pick up the tab for any publication they really want. This belief not only is consistent with prevailing Washington philosophy, but also conforms to the Administration view that the functions government performs should be reduced.

Some would argue, however, that although government publications on the whole might not have been managed well, the functions that information gathering and free or inexpensive dissemination serve are worthwhile and necessary. Atkiss, a Printing and Publishing Officer at the Department of Health and Human Services, argues that the public will get short changed if basic information services are severely cut. "There's no comparison between a statistical report and a publication advising teenagers how to avoid certain diseases," states Atkiss.

Although "publications" are usually thought of as pamphlets and magazines, cutbacks are also occurring in publications like statistical data. The proposed cuts for fiscal year 1983 are small compared with those in many other areas (an estimated \$50.1 million by FY 1983, based on figures provided by the Congressional Research Service), but many believe they would affect nearly every major agency and could affect how certain statistics are used to allocate billions of dollars in government assistance.

Critics of the cuts fear that businesses, educators, state and local governments and even farmers would be adversely affected if the timeliness, accuracy and availability

of many statistics now provided by the government are threatened. Corporations fear that statistics used in making daily business decisions could be eliminated. Less accurate or more sketchy data on the gross national product, retail sales, productivity trends or new housing construction could seriously affect decision making in business and in government.

Sales, Not "Freebies"

The current Administration view is that in most cases services are better provided by the private sector. Or, if people really want a service, they will pay for it.

It is this philosophy that has prompted the Government Printing Office (GPO) to do an about-face in its sales division. In about a year, GPO's documents division drastically reduced the number of publications offered to the public. By reducing the number of titles for sale by around 7,000, GPO hopes to make money on the remaining better sellers.

Public Printer Danford L. Sawyer, Jr. is concerned that GPO's sales division operate in the black. He has created a new marketing division designed to make the public aware of the diverse government documents for sale. Among other techniques, the marketing campaign will publicize "best sellers" in its quarterly *New Catalog*, will use public service spots on radio and T.V. to advertise various programs and publications, and might, under certain circumstances, buy magazine trade ads.

Some are skeptical that the "user fee" philosophy will work. In the case of businesses or corporations it is likely that they will purchase the information they need. Already a consortium of some 15 companies has been formed (including Sears Roebuck, Montgomery Ward and Time Magazine) to buy formerly inexpensive, specialized data from the Census Bureau. Each member of the group will prepare its own tabulations and market them to other users for several times the price the Census Bureau used to charge.

As to the public: serious doubts

remain that individuals will pay substantial prices for what they had been receiving without charge. As Rob Atkiss notes, "It might be difficult to make available, let alone sell, a pamphlet describing low income housing opportunities to those who most need it."

What Does This Mean to Managers?

Even those critical of the cutbacks brought about by the moratorium will admit that the area of government publications has been poorly managed on the whole. A common complaint about agencies' approach to the communications problem has been, "When in doubt, let's put out a little brochure." The "little brochure" mentality allows for each production decision to be made independently without consideration of the agency's overall mission.

The Federal Publishers Committee considers this approach central to the publications management problem. "Publishing decisions should be communications decisions," says Atkiss. "Too many decisions have been program decisions, with parochial considerations only. Little thought has been given to a publication's role as it relates to the mission of the agency."

As a result, some agencies have put out unnecessary or duplicative publications at high costs and without reaching targeted audiences. Also, prior to the moratorium, most agencies did not have accurate figures on how many publications they produced or what they cost.

A report issued by OMB in late September on agencywide publications cutbacks and savings revealed that agencies had never developed a central inventory of periodicals and pamphlets or centralized systems to review and approve them. To comply with the moratorium and the OMB guidelines, each agency had to inventory its publications and implement a control plan to review and reduce that inventory.

OMB collected these inventory lists, transferred the information to a computer file, and returned the printouts to the agencies for verification and correction. For most

agencies, this was the first time they had ready access to this data.

Tom Nebel, publications management officer at the Office of Personnel Management, believes that "responding to OMB's data and cutback requests and establishing OPM's review board helped us track and document our publications costs better. We now have a tighter and better managed publications program."

In the long run ...

Some areas of publications management have improved because of the OMB directives. Benefits have been derived mainly in the areas of cost reduction and data management. It is anticipated that the government will save \$20.8 million in FY 1982 from agency publications terminations, consolidations and cost reduction actions.

There are other areas, however, where publications problems persist. "The moratorium and cutbacks served as a quick fix to save millions of dollars," says Atkiss. "At the Federal Publishers Committee we are looking at ongoing problems like establishing a standard for mailing list formats and establishing classification standards for publications positions where none exist. These are areas where savings will be felt in the long run."

The future of government publications is uncertain. The moratorium was the beginning of a trend to reduce, justify and limit the amounts and free distribution of publications put out by government. Although the cutbacks have not yet adversely affected publications and public affairs positions in government, private contractors and printers have been hard hit by the loss of federal business. GPO estimates that, due to its own decrease in publications, nearly \$24.8 million less will be paid out to private sector printers in FY 1982 than was paid out in 1981.

One thing is certain: managers will have to make conscious decisions about the need, worth, and feasibility of producing any publication before putting it out. A leaflet or brochure will not necessarily best get out the word on an agency

program or service. Funds for publications have dried up. This loss forces managers to rethink and come up with new ideas to meet their communications responsibilities.

Options are being considered by the Administration to replace or supplement traditional publications practices. The President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control has interviewed publications officials at all levels to identify problems in the

field and to possibly offer recommendations. Several agencies have joined business in sharing costs to develop cooperative publications like *Mail Order Rights* (the Federal Trade Commission and American Express) and *Direct Contacts* (the U.S. Office of Consumer Affairs and AT & T).

Also, OMB is noting with interest the success of the Consumer Information Center's (CIC) cooperative effort with the Bar Association

of New York to provide a phone system for consumers with prepared tapes on legal issues. CIC found volunteers to man the switchboard.

Who knows? Telephones and video screens may take the place of brochures and pamphlets in the future. ■

Efstathia A. Siegel is a writer-editor in the Office of Public Affairs, OPM.

GPO's Bestsellers

The publications below are the all-time bestselling Government publications still in active sales inventory. Prices shown were in effect on the date indicated.

Listed below are other publications which have had a recurring demand. The order in which they are listed does not necessarily reflect their rank in total sales.

	Price	*Sold		Price
1. Infant Care	\$4.75	17,465,952	1. Backyard Mechanic, Volume 1	\$4.00
2. Prenatal Care	4.75	11,914,250	2. Backyard Mechanic, Volume 2	4.50
3. Your Child From 1 to 6	5.00	8,955,702	3. Backyard Mechanic, Volume 3	4.50
4. Metric Conversion Card (wallet-size card)	1.75 6.50/100	3,849,498	4. Citizens Band Radio Service Rules, Part 95, Subpart D	4.50
5. Your Child From 6 to 12	5.00	3,503,469	5. Dictionary of Occupational Titles, 4th Edition	23.00
6. Rescue Breathing (wallet-size card)	1.75 5.50/100	2,920,872	6. Handbook of Mathematical Functions	24.00
7. Federal Benefits for Veterans and Dependents	4.25	1,753,682	7. How to Identify and Resolve Radio-TV Interference	5.00
8. United States Postage Stamps	8.50	1,620,807	8. In the Bank . . . Or Up the Chimney?	5.50
9. United States Government Manual	9.50	1,435,177	9. Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1982-83	13.00
10. Adult Physical Fitness	4.50	1,400,006	10. Settlement Costs	4.25
11. Adolescent in Your Home	3.50	1,288,059	11. Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1981	16.00
			12. U.S. Industrial Outlook, 1982	10.00

*(sales figures as of 10-1-81)

Net Spending on Periodicals and Pamphlets (Publications), 1981-83
(Obligations in millions of dollars)

<i>Department or Other Unit</i>	<i>1981 Actual</i>	<i>1982 Estimate</i>	<i>1983 Estimate</i>
Agriculture	17.6	16.0	14.0
Commerce	6.2	5.8	5.8
Defense	30.5	29.5	30.7
Energy	17.2	17.5	13.2
Health and Human Services	21.6	21.4	22.3
Interior	7.4	6.5	6.3
Labor	5.6	4.2	4.5
Treasury	11.4	11.6	11.9
General Services Administration	4.2	4.6	3.5
All Other Independent Agencies	51.4	40.7	39.3
TOTAL GOVERNMENT	173.1	157.8	151.5

Terminations and Other Savings Compared to Cost by Agency

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Publications to be Terminated</i>	<i>Publications with Other Savings Actions</i>	<i>Savings on Publications (Millions of \$)</i>	<i>Cost of Publications (Before Savings)</i>	<i>Savings as a Percent of Cost</i>
DOD	212	439	\$ 3.1	\$ 27.7	11.1%
HHS	87	156	2.5	23.9	10.5*
Agriculture	742	153	2.6	13.3	19.5
Treasury	16	16	0.1	11.7	0.9
Energy	38	117	3.1	8.1	38.3
Labor	186	201	2.2	6.5	33.2
GSA	60	101	0.8	6.3	19.0
Interior	102	306	1.0	6.2	16.1
Commerce	12	159	0.7	6.2	11.3
All Other	274	244	4.5	23.3	19.3
Total Government	1,729	1,892	\$20.8	\$133.2	15.6%

*The percentage of savings is overstated since HHS listed savings on some publications where the costs of the publications were not given.

Put-Down Techniques: Are You Guilty of Them?

By William R. Tracey

"Not guilty!" "Not me!" "Never!" That is the chorus of manager response to the question: Do you use put-down techniques with your subordinates? Yet if you ask the people who work for those same managers if their superiors ever put them down, the answer is, "You bet they do!" Different perceptions of what a put-down is? Possibly. What is more likely is that many managers put down their subordinates without even knowing it. Some few do it consciously.

But, whether conscious or unconscious, failure to show sensitivity to the feelings of subordinates, even lapses in common courtesy or consideration, do a great deal of damage in organizations. At the very least, they cause misunderstanding, resentment or anxiety. At worst, they cause communication gaps, wasted time, unnecessary work, loss of productivity, poor morale and a host of other organizational ills.

Here are some of the most common putdowns.

The Peremptory Summons

Here the subordinate is invited (directed) to report to the superior's office by a telephone call from his or her secretary. "Mr./Ms.

_____ wants to see you immediately," or, from the manager directly, "Come on up (down). I need to talk with you." What is the usual reaction to that sort of summons? Anxiety ("I wonder what I've done now?"), annoyance ("Damn, I'm right in the middle of this ..."), or outright anger ("What am I? A gofer?"). All reactions are negative. What is more important is that the negative responses get in the way of good relationships between managers and subordinates. Obviously, the peremptory summons is discourteous and shows lack of concern or consideration for people. But there are even more serious consequences than negative reactions.

Put-downs can be conscious or unconscious; either way they inflict damage: causing misunderstanding, resentment, unnecessary work and poor morale.

The peremptory summons may interfere with enterprise operations. The call may pull the subordinate away from a critically important task or action just to deal with a matter of much lesser importance—one that could wait.

In addition, the results of such spur-of-the-moment meetings are usually unsatisfactory to both parties. The subordinate is forced to deal with an issue or problem on-the-spot, without an opportunity to get the background needed to deal properly with the matter or the time required to consider alternative actions and their consequences. All too often, the subordinate must return to his or her work area to get the facts and develop a recommendation. Another meeting with the boss is then required—and the time of both manager and subordinate has been wasted.

RULE: If the purpose of the summons is to provide information to the subordinate or to assign a task, say so when you call. "I want to fill you in on ..." or "I need to get some information on ..." or "Let's discuss ..." If the problem or issue is of major importance, give the subordinate time for fact gathering and consideration of possible solutions. "We need to discuss ..." "Please give this some thought and be prepared to discuss ... with me." (Such a meeting should be scheduled for several hours later or, if time permits, the next day.)

Improper Address

Here the put-down occurs because the manager addresses subordinates by their last names. "Jones, please check ..." or worse, "Hey, you. Get the production report up here right now." What is the reaction of the subordinate? Probably irritation or hidden hostility. Those forms of addresses are unquestionably put-downs, and the reactions are certain to be negative. Note that in all cases such forms of address are used in downward communication, never upward. For that reason, the practice can only be perceived as a means of emphasizing the superior-subordinate relationship. Although some people may not openly show resentment (they may have become inured to the practice), improper address is not only patently discourteous and demonstrates lack of sensitivity to people, but it also carries penalties in terms of poor relationships, negative attitudes, lack of team effort and low productivity.

RULE: Always address subordinates properly:
Mr. _____,
Mrs. _____,
Ms. _____ if the work environment is formal, or by first name or nickname if the organizational climate is informal (and the manager is receptive to the use of his or her first name by subordinates). One caution: be careful of nicknames. Be sure that they are not derogatory, do not reflect racial, sexual, nationality or cultural bias and that they are completely acceptable to the subordinate. (Ask if you're not certain.)

Inaccessibility

This managerial error is exemplified by the manager who is invariably "too busy to see you right now." Or the manager who, when presented with a problem, says, "Don't bother me with that now," or "You're paid to solve problems, not to bring them to me." Not only are those tactics put-downs, but they also represent failure to carry out one of the primary managerial functions—directing, which involves providing guidance, counseling and assistance to subordinates. They reflect a lack of concern for people, if not an outright desire to escape responsibility or involvement. Sometimes another person, typically an assistant or secretary, is responsible for the inaccessibility of the superior. Whether this stems from a mistaken belief that it is his or her job to protect the boss from time-consuming contacts with subordinates or from the bald exercise of power, is immaterial. Managers must maintain an open-door policy with their people and ensure that the policy is honored by those who could subvert it.

RULE: Be accessible to your people. Be available and receptive to their concerns. Treat their problems as if they are important (they are to them). Be considerate, available and helpful.

Blame Passing

"Why didn't you inform me of this before?" "How can we explain why we haven't been doing what they want all along?" "If we do it now, I'll look stupid." Such comments are symptomatic of insecurity or unwillingness to assume responsibility. But they also tend to demean the subordinate, put him on the defensive or give her responsibility that rightfully belongs to the superior. The effects of this put-down tactic are lack of respect for the manager, assumption of responsibilities which may be beyond the authority or capability of an individual, wheel spinning, lack of timely response to problems or other organizational woes.

RULE: Take full responsibility for the actions of your subordinates. Absorb all of the blame for failures—and pass on the credit for successes.

Procrastination

This is a managerial mistake which can be fatal to both manager and subordinates. It is exemplified by the manager who says, "I think this matter needs further study" (not because it does, but because the superior is reluctant to make a decision). Or it occurs when the manager has been presented with a recommendation and says, "Before I decide, I want you to develop a complete staff study with supporting cost data and a complete and detailed plan for implementation." The result of procrastination is often make-work projects. Even more often, the result is failure to take action at the opportune time. And still more often, the consequence is "decision by default": either someone else decides or events preclude decision (the decision is overtaken by events).

RULE: Decide when you have most of the facts. Although it may be desirable to get all the facts, doing so often defers the decision until the decision-making point has passed.

Asking for Obscure Details

A favorite put-down technique is to ask subordinates for nitty-gritty details about their work center, work process or people. Usually, the use of the technique is deliberate—to make subordinates aware of the fact that they don't know everything about their operation (and that the manager is more knowledgeable) or to make them feel inadequate. "How many widgets did you produce last month? How many were rejects? How much rework time was involved?" Not only does this tactic make subordinates anxious or cause feelings of inadequacy, it also often causes creation of unnecessary reports, additional paperwork and a host of other time-consuming actions.

RULE: If you need detailed information about any process or action, ask the right person for it and give him or her enough time to get the information. Don't expect or require people to carry all sorts of trivia around with them.

Public Reprimands

One of the most cruel and ruthless put-downs is censure, reprimand or criticism for some failure or error of judgment in the presence of subordinates, peers or colleagues. Its use is certain to put the individual down as well as make him or her angry and resentful. It may even provoke an emotional outburst which will cause the manager some unexpected difficulties. Reprimands in the work area or at staff meetings are inappropriate and ineffective. And they inevitably boomerang on the manager and the organization.

RULE: Censure subordinates in private (after you have given them an opportunity to explain or admit the error). Commend outstanding performance or accomplishment in public.

Inattentiveness

The manager who stares at the ceiling, looks out the window, continues writing or looks bored while a subordinate attempts to discuss a problem, issue or recommendation is putting the subordinate down. And the employee knows it and resents it. Managers who engage in that practice are discourteous. More important, they are failing to act as managers. Moreover, they may miss hearing something of critical importance to the operation and by being rude may well cut off that source of information or expertise in the future.

RULE: Listen to your subordinates. Give them your full and undivided attention when they brief you, bring you a problem or make a recommendation. And let them know that you appreciate their contribution.

Impatience

The manager who is frequently abrupt, impatient or short with subordinates demonstrates immaturity and a lack of concern for people. Such slips in self-control also have the effect of put-downs because they say to the subordinate, "My feelings and emotions have priority over your problems and concerns." Obviously, personal crises, temporary physical discomfort or illness will inevitably cause occasional lapses. But if the trigger is the pressure of the managerial job, or habit, managers must develop the strength of will needed to overcome the tendency to vent their feelings on their subordinates. Good relationships between the superior and employees cannot be developed or maintained in an environment in which the feelings and emotions of the superior take precedence.

RULE: No matter how you feel, regardless of the pressure you experience, always show patience with people. If you are under unusual pressure for whatever reason, whenever possible, defer meetings with subordinates until such time as you can show the patience and understanding your subordinates deserve.

Put-down techniques have no place in organizational life. They are discourteous, inconsiderate and dysfunctional. They cause anxiety and resentment among employees. And, most important, put-downs are some of the most common causes of poor morale, low productivity, wasted time, job dissatisfaction and employee turnover. Avoidance of put-downs will result in positive feelings, more openness, mutual respect, team effort, improved job performance and increased productivity.

William R. Tracey is Director of training at the U.S. Army Intelligence School in Fort Devens, Massachusetts.

Copyright May 1979.

Reprinted with the permission of Personnel Journal, Costa Mesa, California; all rights reserved.

Legislation

Highlights of 1982

Reconciliation

This year's battle of the budget resulted in the passage of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1982, including key changes in federal retirement law.

Most of the changes, originally proposed by OPM, were technical or administrative in nature, designed to streamline the administration of the Civil Service Retirement System.

Others, hammered out between House and Senate Conferees on the Reconciliation measure, changed the actual level of benefit increases for federal retirees in FY 1983. The most significant of these changes is the provision of a cost of living adjustment (COLA) based on 50 percent of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) during the next three years for all federal retirees under the age of 62. All retirees 62 or over will receive full cost of living adjustments. The Conferees added a qualification to this limitation by providing for additional annual percentage increases in COLA based on the difference between actual and projected COLA adjustments based on the CPI during the next three years.

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1982 also provides for a reduction in civil service pay by the dollar amount of the military retirement COLA for military retirees in the federal civilian service. It also mandates a delay of one month for payment of civil service cost of living adjustments in each of the next three years. Moreover, under the

new law, annuities for retiring federal employees will begin the first day of the month after retirement rather than the very first day after retirement. The various changes in the retirement laws resulted in combined savings and new government income amounting to \$317 million over three years. Total civil service savings, including those resulting from COLA's, are projected to be \$4.1 billion over three years.

Alternative Work Schedules

The three year Alternative Work Schedules experiment, authorized by Congress in 1978, was extended for three more years on July 23. The original AWS experiment, often called the "flexitime" program, included 1500 work units and 325,000 federal employees nationwide. The experiment allowed federal employees to vary their reporting and departure times during the working day and also permitted employees to work a 10-hour four day workweek. In a preliminary report in November 1981, and a final report in March 1982, OPM concluded that the AWS experiments were generally successful and that their proper use could result in improvements in productivity, cost savings, employee morale and greater service to the public.

The degree of management control emerged as the central issue in the Spring 1982 legislative ne-

gotiations and Congressional debate over AWS. In February 1982, Rep.

Geraldine Ferraro (D-NY) introduced a bill (HR 5366) that would have made the experimental program permanent. The Administration opposed the Ferraro bill, which passed out of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, because it lacked sufficient management controls. HR 5366 was defeated. OPM's own legislative proposal, S. 2156, was introduced in the Senate by Orrin Hatch (R-UT). In arguing for tighter management control, the Administration proposed that an AWS system be used only when it improves productivity or provides greater service to the government without additional costs.

S. 2156 gave agencies the authority to terminate immediately flexible or compressed work schedules that did not meet productivity, cost or public service criteria. This new management authority generated strong opposition from segments of organized labor, and a long series of negotiations and revisions in language ensued between OPM and Congressional staff, particularly in the Senate. In March, Congress voted to extend the experimental program until negotiations in final language could be concluded. In the meantime, Senator Ted Stevens (R-AK), Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Post Office, Civil Service and General Government, attempted to forge a legislative compromise, representing a balance between management rights and la-

bor interests.

The Stevens bill, S. 2240, provided for management's unilateral elimination within 90 days of experimental or compressed work schedules that increased costs, or reduced productivity or service to the public. It also provided for an expeditious resolution of labor-management disputes on future AWS contracts before the Federal Services Impasses Panel. The final version of the bill won widespread support from both sides of the aisle in the House and Senate, as well as from employee organizations.

Federal Tort Claims

Of proposed legislation affecting personnel management, one of the most important measures was an amendment to the Federal Tort Claims Act that would insulate federal employees from personal liability in "constitutional" tort litigation. Under the current law, federal employees can be held personally liable for alleged violations of constitutional rights of American citizens while carrying out their official duties in the civil service. The Administration has strongly supported legislation that would waive the "sovereign immunity" of the United States and make the government itself, rather than the individual employee, the object of litigation in constitutional tort cases. The proposal (S. 1775) was introduced in the Senate by Charles Grassley (R-Iowa)

Civil Service Benefits Changes

By Efstathia A. Siegel

and a similar proposal was authored in the House by former Congressman George Danielson (D-CA).

Amending the Federal Tort Claims Act in such a fashion has generated considerable controversy. Opponents argue that, in substituting the government for the employee as a defendant in torts, the government is undermining the deterrence that personal accountability of federal employees provides in protecting citizens' constitutional rights. Proponents argue that it is erroneous to charge a federal employee who is acting within the scope of his employment with personal liability when he is not, in any sense, operating in a personal capacity. A public official is, indeed, a public official and not a private agent; and in law, this real and critical distinction should be recognized.

The threat of personal liability and protracted litigation, with attendant financial burdens and damages to reputation, discourages employees, particularly supervisors, from making tough decisions, especially in the area of personnel administration. Suits, even the threat of suits, undermine employee morale and productivity. According to the Department of Justice, there have been approximately 10,000 such suits since 1971. (Only 13 such cases, however, have resulted in judgments against federal employees.)

In spite of strong and continuous support from the Justice Department, OPM and interested employee or-

ganizations, and the efforts of Senator Grassley and Congressman Sam Hall (D-TX), legislation to eliminate personal liability of federal employees has been stalled in the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House. In light of the practical and administrative difficulties under current law, the problem of personal liability in constitutional torts is likely to emerge as a major federal personnel issue in the 98th Congress.

Information on legislation of interest to federal managers is prepared by Robert E. Moffit, Assistant Director for Congressional Relations, OPM.

On September 8, 1982, the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1982 became law. It brought about changes affecting civil service retirement and other benefits. Some of the major changes are:

Cost of Living Adjustments (COLAS)

- Delay effective date of COLA for next 3 years from the current March 1 of each year to April 1, 1983—May 1, 1984—June 1, 1985.
- Notwithstanding the change in effective dates, the amount of the COLA's would continue to be based on the December-to-December increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Entitlement to a COLA and the proration factor for new annuitants will be determined exactly as they are now, with March 1 as the determining date.
- Limit amount of COLA for some annuitants for next 3 years:
Affected annuitants: Under age 62 as of March 1, 1983.
NOT Affected:
—Survivor annuitants
—Disability annuitants
Scheduled increase for under age 62 annuitants:
April 1983—3.3%, plus any amount by which actual CPI exceeds 6.6%
May 1984—3.6%, plus any amount by which actual CPI exceeds 7.2%
June 1985—3.3%, plus any amount by which actual CPI exceeds 6.6%
- Military retirees (other than those receiving retired pay on the basis of a wartime, service-connected dis-

ability) who work in government civilian jobs will have the amount of any cost-of-living increase in their retired pay during fiscal years 1983, 1984 and 1985 deducted from their civilian pay during these three years.

Cap on Annuities

- No COLA adjustments will be made on annuities that exceed the salary of a GS-15, step 10 (now \$57,000), 30 days before effective date of COLA.
- No annuitant will be receiving an annuity greater than the GS salary he or she would have been receiving if actively employed. (For those currently receiving more than they would have been making at their grade and step, annuities will be frozen until a catchup occurs.)

Rounding Down of Annuities

- Retirement annuities will be rounded down to the next lowest dollar, both when they are computed and when they are adjusted by the rise in the cost of living. This will apply to all annuities commencing on or after Oct. 1, 1982 and to COLA's added to annuities beginning April 1, 1983.

Early Retirements

- Effective October 1, 1982, early retirement (50 years and 20 years service or 25 years service at any age) would be permitted:

Involuntary—in the case of involuntary separations during reductions-in-force, major reorganizations, or

transfers of functions only if the employee has not declined an offer of a position in his agency for which he or she is qualified, which is not lower than two grades below his/her current position, and which is in the same commuting area.

Voluntary—only if the major reorganization, reduction-in-force or transfer of function were going to result in a significant number of employees being separated or immediately reduced in pay.

Disability Retirement

- The test period to see whether an employee retired on disability has been restored to earning capacity will be reduced from two years to one year, and the grace period between restoration to earning capacity and termination of the disability annuity will be shortened from one year to six months.

- These provisions apply to earnings after Dec. 31, 1982.

- National Guard Technicians, separated since 12-31-79 for failure to meet physical standards for continued membership in the National Guard are automatically awarded a disability annuity without a review of medical evidence.

- Information contained in the records of the Social Security Administration as well as the Labor Department regarding federal workers' compensation benefits would be available where needed to ensure the accuracy of information used in verifying the earn-

ings reports filed by disability annuitants.

Credit for Military Service

Under the previous law, military service was credited toward a civil service annuity, but the annuity had to be recomputed at age 62 to exclude credit for any post-1956 military service if the individual was eligible for Social Security benefits.

- Now, retirees who were on the government payroll as of October 1, 1982, will have the option of either continuing under the old law and having their annuities reduced at age 62, or making a 7 percent interest-free deposit for their basic military pay and not undergoing the annuity reduction. This deposit must be made by January 1, 1985 if no interest is to be paid. An employee may make this deposit at any time until retirement, but would have to pay interest after the January 1, 1985 date based on whatever the government securities interest rates are when the deposit is made.

- Employees hired on or after October 1, 1982 will not be subject to annuity recomputation at age 62, but will instead receive civil service retirement credit for post-1956 military service only if they deposit a sum equal to 7 percent of the military basic pay they received for such post-1956 service. If they make the deposit within two years of being hired, no interest will be charged. Otherwise, interest will be charged on the basis of whatever the government securities rates

are at the time.

- Those already retired will at age 62 (and those already beyond that age) have their annuities recomputed to restore credit for military service after 1956, but will have the annuity reduced by a dollar amount equal to the portion of their Social Security benefit attributable to military service. This would prove financially rewarding to the 80 percent or more who are short-term veterans. The financial advantage would decline with the increasing length of the annuitant's military service after 1956, and with increases in the proportion of Social Security based on military service.

Interest Rates, Deposits, Refunds and Redeposits

- On January 1, 1985, the interest rate will change from 3% to a variable rate that will be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on the average rate payable on securities in which the fund was invested during the previous year. The rate will be reset annually using the same method.

- **Deposits**—Employees will be required to make deposits, with interest, in order to receive credit for service where contributions were not deducted from the employee's salary (except in the case of certain types of service where the free credit is intentionally provided). This would replace the provision in the old law that allowed the employee to either make the deposit or accept a reduction in his or her annual annuity equal to 10 percent of the deposit.

- **Redeposits**—Both the new interest rates and the required deposit provisions will apply only in the case of the periods of service performed on or after October 1, 1982, and the new interest rate will not apply to the redeposit of refunds made before that date.

- The new law provides that an employee must be separated at least 31 days in order to receive a refund of his/her retirement contributions. Interest paid on refunds will be at the current rates.

Later Commencement Date for Certain Annuities

- The initial annuities will generally commence on the first day of the month after the month in which the employee retires or meets the age and service requirements for a deferred annuity. This provision would not apply to survivor annuities, disability annuities or annuities based on involuntary separation. The old law provided for annuities to commence the day after retirement.

Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982

- This act requires the payer of any periodic payment under any employer-provided pension plan, such as the Civil Service Retirement System, to withhold federal income taxes as if the periodic payment were wages.

Efstathia A. Siegel is a writer-editor in the Office of Public Affairs, OPM.

PACE Abolished: Schedule B Used

In accordance with the court order entered on November 19, 1981, in the civil action, *Luciano v. Devine*, in the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia, the Office of Personnel Management has eliminated the Professional and Administrative Career Examination (PACE). OPM has established a new Schedule B authority to fill professional and administrative career (PAC) entry level positions of GS-5 and GS-7. The *Luciano* decree, which became effective on January 18, 1982 called for PACE to be abolished over the next three years in order to alleviate, to the extent feasible, adverse impact against hispanics and blacks in appointments to positions previously examined for under the PACE.

Under the terms of this new authority, priority in filling vacancies will still be given to employees adversely affected by reduction-in-force and reorganization. Agencies will have to complete consideration of qualified candidates available from reemployment and repromotion priority lists and through OPM's Displaced Employee Program and Interagency Placement Assistance Program before seeking Schedule B authority for external hiring. These procedures are the same as those which agencies pre-

viously had to follow before obtaining PACE certification. In addition, agencies will continue to give appropriate consideration to eligible employees within the area of consideration prescribed in their promotion plans. Once internal sources have been fully used, then agency headquarters offices can seek the Schedule B/PAC authority from OPM to hire from outside the federal government.

In cases where departments and agencies expect to fill a large number of identical PAC positions within a few months, a single request for the authority may be submitted at some reasonable time after the agency has begun its recruiting efforts. Each authority for PAC appointments under Schedule B will be granted for a definite time period (usually 60 days) based on the number of positions to be filled and the probable difficulty of locating qualified candidates. For large scale hiring, authority may be issued for longer than 60 days, with the provision for consideration of priority placement candidates at regular intervals.

In a September letter to PACE eligibles OPM explained that due to the reduced levels of hiring under this Administration, there will be relatively few job openings in PAC positions. Four positions—Internal Revenue Officer, Tax Technician, Social Insurance Claims Examiner and Supply Specialist—are expected to afford the best opportunities.

Abolition of PACE will not prevent agencies from filling PAC positions through special appointing authorities. Those most commonly used for such positions include: the Cooperative Education Program, the Federal Junior Fellowship Program, the Veterans Readjustment Appointments (VRA) authority, employment of the severely physically handicapped, appointment of ACTION and VISTA volunteers and Peace Corps personnel, and conversion of 30 percent disabled veterans from temporary appointments. These programs allow participants to be noncompetitively converted or appointed to the competitive service. However, the PACE written test will no longer be used to measure employees' qualifications for either initial appointment or conversion.

Specific guidelines and instructions can be found in FPM letter 213-32. It will be incorporated into FPM Chapter 213—Excepted Service in the near future.

Also, questions and answers concerning the use of the Schedule B authority are published in FPM Bulletin 213-52, September 16, 1982.

LIA

Salary Cuts Common
Federal employees are not the only U.S. workers hit with reduced pay raises, salary cuts or job eliminations. Millions of private sector employees are also experiencing pay cuts or surrendering cost-of-living

increases and other benefits. Some have to wait longer for raises; others will forfeit bonuses.

Hewitt Associates, a compensation consulting firm, reports about 45% of companies surveyed are reducing originally planned pay raises. Another firm, the Hay Group, states that 70% of companies are holding down labor costs through moves not planned at the year's start. Virtually automatic raises are no longer the rule.

Many executives and economists believe these changes signal a new era of tight-fisted management while others believe the changes are likely to be temporary. Cost control will be a top priority to many companies for the next two years.

Scott Dalton, director of personnel and compensation for Reliance Electric Corp., says, "Companies will be looking more at what they have to pay to be competitive, and at their ability to pay" rather than what they should pay to protect employees from inflation.

The "good news" is that these cost-saving measures may be an aid to curbing inflation. If pay raises and benefits kept rising at about 10% per year, it would be more difficult for inflation to level off, particularly since three-fourths of the U.S. economy is wages, salaries and benefits. (*The Wall St. Journal*, 6/30/82) AG

FEDS "The Last Minority"

The Public Employees Roundtable, an association chaired by Senior Executive Association President G. Jerry Shaw, has been formed to bolster the image of career government employees. At a press conference launching the Roundtable, Shaw cited its three objectives: 1) "to improve the image of government employees in the government employee's mind; 2) to improve the image of government employees with the public so that the public understands the contributions that are being made and; 3) to further the interests of the federal government in accomplishment of its goal." He named several heroes who are federal employees—U.S. Special Envoy Philip Habib, Leonard Skutnik III, and 51 of the 52 Iranian hostages—to emphasize the contributions of federal workers and to sharpen the contrast between fiction and reality in the public's mind.

The Roundtable is composed of 17 federal professional and manager groups including: the Senior Executive Association, the American Society of Public Administration, the Professional Managers Association, the Federal Managers Association, and Federally Employed Women, Inc. The unions have decided to push their own public relations campaigns but the Round-

table will be coordinating with them to avoid any overlaps in advancing the case of the federal career government employee. Eventually, the Roundtable hopes to extend its efforts to local and state government levels.

First on their list of activities is the introduction of a resolution in Congress by Senator John Warner and Congressman Stan Parris designating January 17, 1983 as Public Employees Appreciation Day, to coincide with the signing of the Pendleton Act which created the civil service 100 years ago. Senators Ted Stevens and Charles McC. Mathias; Congressmen Steny Hoyer, Vic Fazio, Cecil Heftel, Charles Pashayan, Michael Barnes, Mervyn Dymally and Frank Wolf; and Congresswoman Barbara Mikulski are supporting the new coalition. Virginia Congressman Wolf related the following: "I think one of the best things I saw was a column by George Will, where he pointed out the danger of criticizing federal employees is when you want to go and use that government to help you. We should remember that the submarine captain who goes to sea for six months at a time is a federal employee. The FBI agent that we would rely on to help us if our children were kidnapped is a federal employee. The drug enforcement agent who is working to keep drugs out of the schools is a federal employee. That NIH researcher for cancer is a federal employee and lastly, the Secret Service agent who stopped the bullet that would have killed the President of the United States is a federal employee."

Referring to career government employees as "the last minority," one bureaucrat said, "There is a comic strip now about bureaucrats and it's funny. They are lazy and they're stupid and indifferent to the public interest. It's humorous and so was Amos and Andy at one time to some people. But we don't tolerate that sort of thing anymore—unless it's directed toward the last minority, the only people left in this country about whom you can make scurrilous public statements that nobody makes objections to or raises eyebrows over."

As one Congressman put it, "Once we who are in government—the presidency, Congress—show respect for the federal employee; then we might expect the American people to do so." LIA

Women's Management Aptitudes

Women make better managers than men, according to aptitude tests directed and evaluated by the Johnson O'Connor Research Foundation. Over a quarter of a million men and women were tested on twenty-two aptitudes ranging from memory to manual dexterity to abstract visualization. In fourteen aptitudes, there were virtually no differences between the sexes. Of the remaining eight, women scored higher than men.

Women were found to excel in abstract visualization (ability to work with theories and principles), observation,

rate of idea-flow, accounting aptitude, silograms (ability to form association between known and unknown words), and finger dexterity. Men excelled in grip and structural visualization (three dimensional thinking).

Aptitudes underlying successful management—especially objective personality, abstract visualization and high English vocabulary—are predominant in women.

"Theoretically, at least, there ought to be more women in management," states Jon J. Durkin, author of *The Potential of Women Research Bulletin* citing the test results.

A free copy of the Bulletin may be obtained by writing the Johnson O'Connor Research Foundation, 11 East 62 Street, Dept. W, New York, N.Y. 10021. AG

The Private Sector and Performance Appraisals

In response to employees' complaints that subjective, general performance appraisals are incorrect, many companies are drafting more objective performance reviews, according to the American Society for Personnel Administration. William Mercer, Inc. has also found that the more objective appraisal has gained favor due to the protection it provides from lawsuits. Some notable companies leaning toward increasingly objective performance appraisal include Colt Industries, Weyerhaeuser and Lockheed Corporation. (*The Wall Street Journal*, 3/2/82) LIA

Overcoming Computer Fears

Mention the word computer and many managers' minds will immediately turn off. Like it or not, managers must be able to understand and use computers to a large degree in order to work effectively in today's office.

According to a Booz, Allen and Hamilton Inc. study on the subject, about one third of all "knowledge workers"—managers and professionals—are wary rather than receptive to the use of computers (read video terminals, keyboards, word processors, etc.).

Surprisingly, managerial resistance to computerized systems does not seem to be directly related to an individual's age or educational level. Rather, managers' fear: looking stupid, losing control of their work product or being replaced.

Suggestions that might help managers overcome their computer fears are:

- *Buy a small home computer.* By practicing at home, you can learn to perform, thereby making office use come more easily.
- *Learn by solving "real-life" problems.* Pick a real, rather than simulated, work problem when learning to operate the machine. Solving actual problems can be a real incentive to acceptance.
- *Position the screen and yourself properly.* A screen should be just slightly below the horizontal line of vision, no closer than 18 inches and no farther than two and one half feet from user. A firm backed chair for long periods of use helps.

- *Use proper lighting.* Make adjustments to lighting so that maximum light is achieved with minimum glare on screen (attach a hood to the screen, if necessary).

- *Adjust the screen's lighting.* To make it easier to read the screen, increase the contrast until the background is virtually black and the letters come up sharp and bright.

- *Use custom glasses.* Eye strain can be a real problem when looking at the screen for a long time. The screen distance should be a comfortable reading distance. Experts advise tinting glasses slightly to reduce glare. (*The Government Manager*, 4/19/82) EAS

Lundborg's Laws

1. Multiply yourself. Don't try to do it all yourself.
2. Pick winners. Good people are tough to get, tough to manage, and tough to hang on to—but good people cost less because of their greater output.
3. Don't settle for second best. The greatest enemy is mediocrity—and the only alternative is excellence.
4. Let them run. If you have picked winners, you won't cash in on them unless you let them run.
5. Don't alibi. When things go wrong, don't make excuses, and don't pass the buck—upward, downward, or laterally.
6. Be a clock watcher. Be a good manager of time.
7. Don't be a deaf mute. Communicate—and do it with your ears as well as your eyes.

8. Keep your motor tuned and your oil changed. Stay healthy.

(*The Art of Being an Executive*, Louis B. Lundborg 1981)

Declare War On Bureaucracy

A leaflet from The American Management Association transmits the following:

"Ask any former G.I. about the horrors of bureaucracy. You'll probably hear some good stories about dress shirts delivered when ammunition was needed, snowshoes in the tropics and other memorable goofs.

Everyone has, from time to time, run into personal examples of rampant bureaucracy. They usually revolve around attempts to deal with a government agency at some level. However, the government doesn't have a monopoly on bureaucrats: There are many organizations in the private sector that are the bureaucratic rival of any government agency.

We seem as a nation to have become inured to bureaucracy. Each time we do not get the merchandise we ordered, or our credit card bill is wrong and we attempt to straighten out the error, we run into the "that's not my department" syndrome. Usually, when the matter is cleared up, we only mutter, "bureaucrats," and let it go at that. By accepting, even tacitly, that bureaucracy does exist at every stage of our society we are giving in to excess paper work, higher prices (to support extra workers), lower productivity and a lack of effectiveness among working people.

The question is not why bureaucrats exist—unfortunately they do—but why are they so plentiful in U.S. business?

Many theories have been advanced as to why bureaucracy continues its insidious spread. One theory is that the creation of larger staff functions in many organizations has led to the growth of bureaucracy. One advocate of this idea is Peter Drucker who recently reported that since the 1950s staff functions at many manufacturing companies have grown five to ten times as fast as the number of operating people. In Drucker's view this "proliferation of staff services deprives them of effectiveness. Worse, it destroys the effectiveness of the people who produce the results, the operating people."

An efficient staff operation gives necessary assistance to the line, but when the staff becomes the system, it is time to step back and take a look at the many management layers that have formed almost unnoticed. There are far more management layers in some large American firms than there are in similar Japanese firms. I call this the organizational "layered look," that leads, inevitably, to the "laminated corporation." It is hard work to shed the excess staff layers and make the organization porous enough so top management can hear the ideas and suggestions that percolate up from all employees.

I'm sure you'll find yourself nodding your head in agreement if I say that everyone should be on the front line in the struggle against bureaucracy. It's something we're all

against. And yet, as I have tried to suggest, bureaucracy has so insinuated itself into our lives that many of us are "closet" bureaucrats without even knowing it.

If you would like to find out whether you're a closet bureaucrat, try giving honest answers to these questions:

- Are all the procedures I follow necessary? Do they move the company toward its goals?
- Are my memos necessary and productive? Or are they "mattress memos," designed to fall back on?
- Are my priorities correct? Or am I engaging in "busy work?"
- Do I tolerate bureaucracy in my unit?

The answers, of course, are your secret. But look around: How many of the managers with whom you work could pass this test? Remember that bureaucrats are made, not born. With that in mind, look at your organization: Is the individual at the top one who actively manages or one who merely presides? Do your colleagues pursue the goals of the organization—that is, work to get the job done—or do they spend the better part of their time inventing new forms, refining reports and making lists.

The average bureaucrat in any firm is likely to be someone who really does not understand the goals and objectives of the company and how his or her individual performance can contribute to achieving these goals and objectives. Enough misdirected activity results in a steadily growing bureaucratic system which slowly strangles productivity, initiative and, eventually, income.

There are a number of defenses against creeping bureaucracy. One is to be sure all managers and employees at every level understand the goals and the mission of the organization and gear their every action to furthering those goals and that mission.

Another, which is essentially the responsibility of top management, is to create a working environment in which individuals are amply rewarded for achievement and initiative. Within this climate every employee should feel free to contribute ideas and have those ideas objectively listened to if not acted upon.

Bureaucracy is not impossible to defeat, it just takes constant vigilance. It develops slowly like an incoming tide until, like a tide, it engulfs both organizations and people.

Let's start a new national movement to eliminate bureaucracy. We'd not only be helping to improve productivity; we'd be helping our own organizations and the nation as well."

Thomas R. Horton, President, American Management Associations.

Survival Tips

At a time when many of us question our job security, Camden and Associates of Hinsdale, Ill. offers tips on how to hold on to your job, and/or how to be prepared, financially and professionally, for when the ax falls. Although aimed at executive types, these tips could apply to just about any job. Survival tips include:

- Concentrate on the bottom line; determine how to boost company revenues or goals.
- Evaluate yourself monthly to gauge performance.
- Watch for danger signs within your company or agency, such as a wage freeze.
- Find out how organizational changes will affect your position and department.
- Start economizing—delay major purchases and vacations; save more of your salary.
- Develop a job-search strategy; update your resume.
- *Only* launch a search when you're certain to be fired: otherwise, it could easily backfire.
- Start networking; develop a list of many people to call should the ax fall.
- Brush up on interviewing skills.

(Industry Week, 4/19/82)
EAS

"Training is everything. The peach was once a bitter almond; cauliflower is nothing but cabbage with a college education." (*Pudd'nhead Wilson's Calendar*, Mark Twain)

Making the Most of Executive Development Assignments

by Frederick S. Ciaccio

Having recently completed a six-month executive developmental assignment with a major command in the Department of the Army, I would like to share some suggestions based on my experiences. The information is intended to provide both management officials and potential candidates a personal and practical perspective on some essential elements of an executive development program.

Getting Ready. An employee should determine his or her short- and long-term career goals well in advance of considering developmental assignment. The short-term goals should concentrate on a self-development program including (but not limited to) college courses, correspondence courses, government training and seminars that will prepare the employee for both the developmental assignment and, ultimately, for attainment of long-term career objectives. Proper self-development is important because an executive developmental assignment is usually in a different career classification or level; a background conducive to successful performance of new and different duties is extremely helpful. As a rule, there are more applicants for executive development than there are available assignments, so prior self-development would definitely indicate an employee's motivation for such an assignment to the selecting official or

panel. Again, the importance of setting goals and objectives in developing one's career path can't be overemphasized: haphazard preparation will produce doubtful results and benefits; too often, none at all.

Getting Set. After establishing your career goals and objectives and meeting criteria your organization may have on executive development, you should be ready for an executive development detail. If your organization does not have such a program, you should discuss your desire for a developmental assignment with your supervisor and training officer.

The detail can be within your immediate organization, other offices within your general organization, state or local government, or in private industry organizations that provide you with the necessary experience. The precise location depends on your established career goals and objectives. I would recommend an assignment outside your immediate organization because a major part of executive development involves learning and observing management techniques associated with organizational structures different from your own. The developmental program promotes an exchange of information on management, technical, and administrative techniques that can benefit both organizations involved.

After the location of your assignment has been arranged, your specific position or assignment must be determined. A formal posi-

tion description should be provided to you at the start of the detail. You should play a major role in preparing it. I believe the best way to establish a position description for your detail is to meet with the supervisor of the supporting organization and discuss your career goals and what you plan to achieve in the assignment. For example, a nonsupervisory candidate would definitely want a position that involved supervision. Quite possibly an already-established position description can be modified to meet your requirements. A position that doesn't fulfill your career development needs will be worthless to you and to the long-range goals of your agency's executive development program.

An assigned employee should be provided with a formal position description and, if possible, performance standards at the beginning of the assignment. At the end of the detail, a formal performance evaluation should be prepared and discussed with the employee. It would also be advisable for the employee to receive a mid-detail evaluation to assure that the developmental assignment is going as planned. Performance evaluations are an important part of the executive development program because they provide valuable feedback on progress and achievements to the employee and to the parent organization. Of course, a copy of any evaluation should be included in the employee's personnel file.

The Right Time. A time frame that includes the greatest level of significant activity should be selected. A person detailed as a budget analyst, for example, would logically choose the time frame in which the budget is being developed and submitted to higher authority; selection of another period would certainly limit the learning experience.

Summary. I consider it a privilege to have been selected for executive development, and believe that the payoff for an employee selected for a developmental assignment is well worth the effort required in advance preparation. Training courses and other instruction provide valuable information necessary to keep abreast of new developments, but they lack the day-to-day complexity of 'real world' situations and demands. The judicious use of such assignments can provide high potential employees the opportunity to gain new experience and bridge the gap to higher responsibility. In the long run, the executive development program can provide tangible benefits resulting in a more effective and efficient government. However, to accomplish this end, positive attitudes by the organizations involved, selection of motivated high potential employees and adequate preparation for developmental assignments are of prime importance.

Frederick S. Ciaccio is a program analyst at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island, Illinois.

Where Credit is Due

Through oversight, Robert R. Snow, Assistant to the Director for Public Affairs, United States Secret Service, was not listed as the author of the article "How the Secret Service Handles Stress," which appeared in the last issue of **Management**. We regret the error, and here thank the author for the useful information on the Secret Service's stress management program.

Employee "Institutions" Defended

I am writing to express my grave concern about the article entitled "Beware the Employee Turned Institution," written by Jeffery P. Davidson.

This article describes an employee who has become an "institution." The typical "institution" employee is described as one who has a particular expertise that is useful. This person is also resistant to change, knows the

organization's rules and "system." The article goes on to describe as "cover up techniques" that the employee is careful about preparing time sheets and responds quickly to directives. Mr. Davidson probably doesn't realize that this is what they're supposed to do.

These employees are described as experts on vacation rules and often are union officials.

Mr. Davidson goes on to assert, without basis, that such employees cause a number of sins such as lower productivity, bad morale, etc.

I find this article unworthy of publication. Mr. Davidson fails to show any causal link between an "institutional" employee and poor performance. He merely asserts that there is one. Knowing the rules, which Mr. Davidson asserts is somehow bad, is encouraged by my agency. Mr. Davidson also implies that "institutional" employees carefully watch their paychecks and their leave. Only a jerk is not careful with money today and I assume vacation and sick leave is granted to be used.

Mr. Davidson also asserts that "institutional"

employees resist change. It can be shown that change for the sake of change holds no benefit. Excessive change is cited as a cause of "burnout" in the article beginning on page three of your publication.

Mr. Davidson has written a bad article where he substitutes assertions and conclusions for logic. He neglects any attempt at a cause and effect relationship between his assertions and conclusions, he sticks labels on employees of a background and decrees that they are bad, because he said so.

Mr. Davidson's article shows why American business and government is in such great shape today. They probably listen to him.

Robert H. Masnik
Northern Virginia

P.S. As for "institutional" employees being union officials, I was given to understand that this is their statutory right. IRS encourages good relations with the union.

MANAGEMENT

How to Subscribe!

The Office of Personnel Management does not handle subscription arrangements for **Management**. Subscriptions are purchased through the Government Printing Office which provides both individual subscriptions and bulk subscriptions for Federal agencies.

Individual Subscriptions. A year's Subscription (four quarterly issues) may be purchased by sending a check or money order to: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The annual cost is \$10.00

domestic, \$12.75 foreign. Single copies are \$2.27 domestic, \$3.45 foreign. (Master Card and Visa accepted.)

Federal Agency Bulk Subscriptions. Federal Government agencies may order bulk supplies of **Management** at reduced prices through sharing the publication cost by "riding" OPM's printing requisition. Agency requisitions (Standard Form 1) should be submitted through the Washington, D.C. area headquarters printing officer of the agency, citing OPM printing requisition No. 3-00035. Agencies may

order a bulk supply from GPO and make their own distribution to component offices, or they may request GPO to send a quantity to the headquarters level and have other quantities mailed to component offices. A mailing list should be attached to the Standard Form 1 showing the number of copies to be sent to each address. Orders should be sent to: U.S. Government Printing Office, Planning Service, Washington, D.C. 20401.

For more information, call (202) 632-4400 or (202) 254-8760.



**United States
Office of
Personnel
Management**

